UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,332	07/14/2003	Chuanxiong Guo	MS1-2713US	6663

22801 7590 03/03/2009

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
BAROT, BHARAT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,332	GUO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bharat N. Barot	2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are pending and remain for further examination.

The new grounds of rejection

2. Applicants' arguments and amendments with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17 filed on November 26, 2008 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bracho et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,443) in view of Koch (U.S. Patent No. 7,207,008).

5. As to claim 1, Bracho et al teach a method (see abstract; figures 1, 5, 10, and 12; and column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62) comprising: receiving at least one network attachment point change event subscription from at least one network attachment point change event subscriber; receiving at least one network attachment point change event publication from at least one network attachment point change event publisher; and for each network attachment point change event publication matching a network attachment point change event subscription, notifying the network attachment point change event subscriber of the matching published network attachment point change event (figures 5, 10, and 12; column 10 lines 47-61; column 12 line 45 to column 13 line 44; and column 15 lines 1-42). Occurrence of event in a network is well known and inherent in the art at the time the invention was made as a network attachment point change event (figure 10; and column 12 lines 45-55).

However, Bracho et al do not explicitly teach that the network attachment point change events comprising an indication of a change in a network address of a device on a network; and an application layer refers to a second attachment point on the network by using a first network attachment point identifier.

Koch explicitly teaches that the network attachment point change events comprising an indication of a change in a network address of a device on a network from a first network attachment point having a first network attachment point identifier to a second network attachment point having a second network attachment point; and an application layer refers to the second attachment point on the network by using the first

network attachment point identifier (see abstract and summary of the invention; figures 5-6; column 4 line 3 to column 5 line 11; column 6 lines 4-30; and column 9 lines 15-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Koch stated above in the method of Bracho et al because it would have provided much faster and more efficient way handling multiple instance of events and avoiding duplication of work in a distributed network environment.

6. As to claims 2-3, Koch teaches that each network attachment point change event publication comprises: identification of an original network attachment point; and identification of a current network attachment point different from the original network attachment point; and each identification of a network attachment point comprises an Internet protocol (IP) address (column 5 line 48 to column 6 line 30).

7. As to claim 4, Bracho et al teach that each network attachment point change event subscription comprises identification of a network attachment point that has attached a communications peer with which the network attachment point change event subscriber has at least one active communication connection (figure 1; and column 5 lines 35-51).

8. As to claim 5, Bracho et al teach that the at least one network attachment point change event publication comprises: a first network attachment point change event publication from a first network attachment point change event publisher; a second network attachment point change event publication from a second network attachment point change event publisher; and matching the first network attachment point change event to each network attachment point change event subscription comprises: determining that the network attachment point change event subscription was placed by the second network attachment point change event publisher; and determining that the second network attachment point change event occurred within a time interval of the first network attachment point change event (figures 7-9 and 12; and column 14 line 21 to column 15 line 64).

9. As to claims 6-7, Bracho et al teach that matching the network attachment point change event to the network attachment point change event subscription comprises determining that the network attachment point change event subscription was placed by a subscriber with a private network address (reference teaches that subscriber within same hub with publisher); and for each network attachment point change event subscriber, determining if the network attachment point change event subscriber has a private network address (reference teaches that subscriber not within same hub with publisher; therefore, subscriber has a private network address) (figures 1 and 7-8; and column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62).

10. As to claim 8, Bracho et al teach that each network attachment point change event subscription comprises a network attachment point change event subscriber notification address (ID); and determining if the network attachment point change event subscriber has a private network address (reference teaches that subscriber not within same hub with publisher; therefore, subscriber has a private network address) comprises determining if the network attachment point change event subscriber notification address is in accord with the public source of the network attachment point change event subscription (reference teaches that subscriber within same hub with publisher) (figures 1, 7-8, and 11-12; column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62; and column 13 line 58 to column 15 line 64).

11. As to claim 9, Bracho et al teach a method (see abstract; figures 1, 5, 10, and 12; and column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62) comprising: sending a subscribe message to a virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service subscribing to at least one network attachment point change event published by a remote peer (figures 1, 5, and 12; column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62; column 10 lines 47-61; and column 15 lines 1-42). Occurrence of event in a network is well known and inherent in the art at the time the invention was made as a network attachment point change event (figure 10; and column 12 lines 45-55).

However, Bracho et al do not explicitly teach that the at least one network attachment point change event comprising a change in a network address of the remote peer; and receiving a notify message from the virtual connectivity subscribe-notify

service notifying of a network attachment point change event published by a remote peer.

Koch explicitly teaches that the at least one network attachment point change event comprising a change in a network address of the remote peer; and receiving a notify message from the virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service notifying of a network attachment point change event published by a remote peer (see abstract and summary of the invention; figures 5-6; column 4 line 3 to column 5 line 11; column 6 lines 4-30; and column 9 lines 15-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Koch stated above in the method of Bracho et al because it would have provided much faster and more efficient way handling multiple instance of events and avoiding duplication of work in a distributed network environment.

12. As to claims 10-11 and 13, Koch teaches that sending a publish message to the virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service publishing a network attachment point change event, wherein the publish message comprises: an identifier of a previous network attachment point and an identifier of a current network attachment point; and the notify message comprises: an identifier of a previous network attachment point of the remote peer, and an identifier of a current network attachment point of the remote peer (see abstract and summary of the invention; figures 5-6; column 4 line 3 to column 5 line 11; column 6 lines 4-30; and column 9 lines 15-55).

13. As to claim 14, Bracho et al teach that sending a publish message to the virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service publishing a local network attachment point change event (figures 1 and 10; column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62; and column 12 line 45 to column 13 lines 49).

14. As to claim 15, Bracho et al teach that the virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service is located in a public address space (reference teaches that subscriber within same hub with publisher); and the subscribe message is sent from a private address space (reference teaches that subscriber not within same hub with publisher; therefore, subscriber has a private network address) (figures 1, 7-8, and 11-12; column 4 line 34 to column 5 line 62; and column 13 line 58 to column 15 line 64).

15. As to claim 16, Koch teaches that as a result of receiving the notify message, sending a Connection Update Request message to the remote peer requesting a Connection Update message from the remote peer (figures 5-6 and 10-11; column 9 lines 15-55; and column 10 line 47 to column 11 line 35).

16. As to claims 17-23, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1-11 and 13-16 above, since claims 17-24 are merely an apparatus for performing the method of operations defined in the claims 1-11 and 13-16 and also do not teach or define any new limitations than above claims 1-11 and 13-16.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. The examiner has attempted to answer (response) to the remarks (arguments) in the body of the Office action.

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

/Bharat N Barot/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455

February 23, 2009